

March 22, 2018

Gary Fuller, Principal Planner  
Carly Aubrey, Senior Planner  
Akida Rouzi, Senior Planner  
Department of Planning  
300 Park Avenue  
Falls Church, Virginia 22046

Re: Broad and Washington (Munis #2015-0764)  
Response to Staff Comments Letter dated November 8, 2017

Dear Gary, Carly, and Akida:

Please accept the below responses to your comments dated November 8, 2017. Many of the issues raised in your comments have been further discussed with City staff, at Boards and Commissions meetings, and the City Council.

1. **Park place elevation (north elevation)** - While some improvements were made like additional fenestrations and architectural details, with the lack of adequate modulations the overall composition appears monolithic. Consider providing design elements that adds visual interest to break away from rigid appearance of the façade. (City's Design Guidelines)

Response: In response to comments from the City Council, AAB, and staff, the Applicant has significantly altered the north façade. Specifically the following changes have been made:

- Corner of Residential building at the Public plaza has been enhanced with additional articulation and now subtly poses as a tower.
- Two story brick base along City lot redesigned and features new fenestration as well as horizontal and vertical articulation, in the form of projecting brick courses and strategically placed recesses.
- Levels 3-7 of the residential above brick base continue the vertically oriented recesses helping break the facade into smaller components.
- Levels 3-7 also features two different forms of siding featuring three different colors, arranged in such a way as to mirror the vertical bays recently added to E. Broad street. Strategically placed recesses and varying siding patterns generate sufficient

visual interest and greatly help in breaking the visual monotony of the board and batten pattern previously seen.

- Height of the residential facade along the lot line reduced by a few feet to further reduce the scale of the facade.

2. **Public access** – The 2<sup>nd</sup> story courtyard between the office and the residential building is provided as private public space and now has direct access from Broad Street. The extent to which this private space is available for public use in terms of hours and access should be clarified in future submissions and VCs. [Sec. 48-1140(1) & (2)].

Response: The Applicant has worked extensively on the design and accessibility of the public plaza. The space is designed to function essentially as a public park, with open and inviting entrances that will draw in the public. To that end, the public stairs on E. Broad Street have been reconfigured and widened to create a more grand and open feeling. Additionally, a second stair access has been provided on the north side of the plaza to further enhance the public accessibility. The new northern entrance is designed to connect physically and visually to the City parking lot and a new public pedestrian path from N. Washington Street to the City parking lot. The public accessibility has been further enhanced with additional wayfinding signage to ensure clarity on the public nature of the space.

The VCs have been revised to provide further operational details for the space. The VCs contain initial hours when the space is open to the public, with the ability to adjust those hours in consultation with the City Manager. Additionally, the VCs include a requirement to appoint a point of contact for

3. **Public Parking** – Greater clarity and details are needed for the proposed public parking - access hours, quantity, proposed location within the garage, etc.

Response: The VCs have been revised to add further detail regarding public parking. Specific hours of operation are now included. Additionally, additional details for inclusion in the parking management plan are also included. The number of parking spaces available will vary depending upon demand from building tenants.

4. **Environment** - The Washington and Broad area is a major contributor to a flooding issue on Douglass Avenue due to the almost complete impervious nature of the area. It is for this reason City staff strongly urges the development to retain the first inch onsite as the previous submittal's comments noted. Additionally, greater detail should be paid to minimizing the amount of impervious surfaces, providing native landscaping, and other techniques to enhance the environmental quality. [Enclosure 4]

Response: The Applicant has worked closely with City staff to revise its SWM facilities. The updated CDP reflects the culmination of those discussions and the provision of stormwater controls over and above the City's current requirements. Based upon the stormwater facilities now provided, downstream flooding potentially attributable to this

site will be significantly reduced. Additionally, the VCs continue to provide for all native plantings in our landscaping.

5. **Shared parking analysis** –The Shared Parking Study, prepared by Walker Parking Consultants, discusses operational assumptions that led to their parking capacity recommendations. The requested parking reduction and analysis will be reviewed in association with TDM components as justification for the request. [§48-970] [Enclosure 1 & 2]

Response: Acknowledged. A full TDM proposal is included as part of this submission and the VCs related to TDM have been updated based upon discussions with City staff.

6. **Transportation Demand Management Plan** –The City’s Mobility for all Modes Plan established the following strategy, “To the extent possible, meet increased travel demand within, from, and through the City via non-automobile modes.” TDM and PMPs for new developments are critical tools for this strategy. Continue to work with the City’s Transportation Planning staff in developing an acceptable TDM. [Enclosure 1 & 2]

Response: A full TDM proposal is included as part of this submission and the VCs related to TDM have been updated based upon discussions with City staff.

7. **On-street parking on Broad Street** – while there is general support for the concept in the Comprehensive Plan, the potential for impacts on vehicular movement on Broad Street and the substantial reduction in the streetscape width will need to be considered. Without a comprehensive approach of implementing on-street parking on Broad Street, it is unclear to staff whether it will be successful here considering the potential impacts. As such, staff recommends that on-street parking be eliminated from the proposed plans.

Response: On-street parking on E. Broad Street is no longer proposed.

8. **Fiscal impact** –The proposed office building component will provide for a commercial corner at the Broad and Washington intersection. However, since the City’s current Future Land Use plan and Zoning designates this site for business uses only, stronger commitments to quality retail will be essential. As heard from the City Council, condominiums or age-restricted units in lieu of all apartments, an additional floor of office, and anchor retail like a grocery store should be explored.

Response: The Applicant has worked extensively to meet the City’s comments on the office and retail components. In response, the top floor of the office has been converted from penthouse space to an additional level of office. The project now contains 73,700 square feet of office. Additionally, the ground floor uses have been significantly refined to reflect a vibrant mix of uses that will create a fantastic streetscape, but also meets the fiscal expectations of the City. A large grocer was explored. However, we did not receive interest in the site. Additionally, adding a grocer would require significant changes to the design, including incorporating the City lot to accommodate truck loading. That loading would significantly interfere with the operation of Clare and Dons and

Argias. Additionally, a large grocer would not encourage the same level of street activity as the uses being proposed. Most patrons of a grocer drive into the site, park in the garage, and then leave in their cars. Such uses do not significantly encourage pedestrian activity.

However, we understand the desire for a grocery use on the site from a fiscal standpoint. In response, we have included 6,000 square feet of Specialty Grocery space. We envision end users like the Local Market or the Italian Store fitting into that space. Those types of users, combined with the significant restaurant program will create a lively street that enhances the Arts and Entertainment District and creates a connection between the State Theater and Creative Cauldron.

9. **Voluntary Concessions** – Additional comments and revisions should be anticipated as draft VC's are currently under staff review at the management level.

Response: Acknowledged.

10. **Pedestrian improvements** – additional crosswalks among other improvements as identified in staff review comments below are needed to improve accessibility and connectivity with surrounding sites. [Enclosure 2 & 4]

Response: The current CDP and VCs include new brick crosswalks on all four legs of the Washington Street and Broad Street intersection. Based on our further analysis of mid-block crosswalks and negative response from Boards and Commissions, we have not included any mid-block crosswalks in the current submission.

The following are the staff review comments on the 5th submission with references to the enclosed/attached memos from staff that provide the detailed comments and additional information. With your next submission, please provide a response letter in annotated format addressing all comments:

### **Planning/Development Review**

#### **Conceptual Development Plan, Rezoning Book and Site Plan Requirements**

11. Sheet C2.0: Applicants for special exception approval for office or mixed-use development may request a reduction in required parking subject to submission and approval of a TDM plan. This is done through a waiver. The requested variance for parking needs to be changed to a waiver under the Requested Land Use Actions. [Sec. 48-970].

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

12. All relevant sheets: The property owner names provided for 107 Lawton Street does not match the City Assessors page. Confirm the correct owners and update sheets as needed. [Sec. 48-1137(6)]

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

Sheet C2.0: Under Requested Land Use Actions, 10 feet is shown as additional height requested under the Special Exception, and 81 feet is listed on Cross Section A-A. The building height at the corner of East Broad Street and North Washington Street is shown at 89 feet in the architectural plans (page 15). The requested bonus height should be 15 feet to be accurate and all references should reflect that.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

Sheet C2.0: Provide bike parking tabulation in accordance with the City of Falls Church bike parking requirements and standards on sheet C2.0 and page 25 of the Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

13. Sheet C4.0 and Sheet C4.1: The existing median on the North Washington is shown differently on these two sheets. Are changes to the existing median proposed with the alternative plan sheet C4.1? Staff recommends median cut at Park Place. See Enclosure 1 and 4 for details.

Response: The median cut is now shown consistently on all sheets. Further, a VC related to the median break is included.

14. Sheet C4.0: Conceptual Development Plan sheet does not show the proposed location of the transformers as shown on other sheets including the landscape plan. Include in future submissions.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

15. Sheet C4.0: Are the proposed crossings on Lawton and mid-block on East Broad brick? It is not specified. Label all brick paved crossing as such and provide dimensions/width. This is also not clear in the Voluntary Concessions.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

16. Sheet C4.1: Proposed location of transformers should be shown on the Alternative Conceptual Development Plan (if this plan sheet is included in future submissions) to avoid any confusion or assumption that transformers are not proposed at the current location with the on-street parking scheme.

Response: The alternative concept has been removed.

17. Sheet C4.1: An alternative conceptual development plan shows on-street parking along E. Broad Street. At this time the City does not have a plan for on-street parking along Broad.

The future success of such proposal is unclear due to potential impacts to vehicular movement on Broad. Additionally, the 20 foot setback along Broad and Washington Streets is measured from the face of curb, existing and/or proposed. Any potential reduction in streetscape width and the 9 to 10-foot clear pedestrian way that may be impacted by on-street parking will need to be considered. There is no staff support at this time for this plan.

Response: The alternative concept has been removed.

18. Sheet C6.0: At the west end of the proposed pocket park, where the pedestrian path connects with the City parking lot, the proposed landscape design terminates at the lot line in somewhat of an unceremonious manner. Subject to City review and agreement, consider providing additional landscaping in the small area shown north of the pedestrian path. A minimal entry design would make sense here.

Response: The Applicant has tried to make the connection in the safest and most logical location.

19. Sheet C7.0 - C8.0: Remove graphic scale for 1" = 20 feet on the bottom of the sheet since each graphic is shown with its correlating scale on this one page.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

20. Sheet C7.0: The Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets recommends 8" for the distance between the curb and the planter edge, and a specific brick pattern that's perpendicular to the curb is also recommended. The recommended 8" is provided, but a slightly different pattern is shown on the CDP. See page 19 of the Streetscape Design Standards for specifics.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

21. Sheet C7.0 and C8.0: The plan view and cross section views for both East Broad and North Washington streetscape do not match. Both plan view and section views should provide the same elements and dimensions consistent with the streetscape standards.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

22. Sheet C7.0 - C8.0: The Streetscape Design Standards recommends the following spacing dimensions: 56 feet for light pole spacing, 84 feet for Trash & Recycling Can Spacing, 84 feet for bench spacing, and 28' for tree spacing. All spacing dimensions should be shown on Sheet C7.0 and C8.0.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

23. Sheet C7.0 and C8.0: The street section details provided does not show brick pavers between the curb and the planter edge. Section details should match the plan details.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

24. Sheet C7.0 - C8.0: Provide dimensions for streetscape zones in plan view consistent with the section view (pedestrian zone, building zone, and amenity zone) for staff review, specifically where canopy columns are located.

Response:

25. Sheet C7.0 - C8.0 and other relevant sheets: 16-foot brick paver crosswalks are recommended for all four legs of the East Broad and North Washington intersection.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

26. Sheet C9.0: Confirm that all streetscape furniture is in accordance with recommendations in the Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets.

Response: Confirmed.

27. Sheet C11.0: This sheet should indicate how many paid public parking spaces are provided and where.

Response: The number of spaces available for public parking will vary depending upon demand from the project's tenants.

28. Sheet C11.0: Bike parking is shown on street level at multiple locations per the Conceptual Parking Plan sheet, but the Conceptual Development Plan sheet does not include these. Please reconcile proposed conditions across all relevant plans and sheets.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

29. Sheet C11.0: The pedestrian crossing and striping shown in illustrations on page 48 of Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book is not shown on the CDP. It should be shown on the conceptual development plan parking layout sheets and any parking layout sheet provided in the Rezoning book.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

30. Sheet C12.0: Plant lists will need to be consistent with VCs in terms of height/size, etc.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

31. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Perspective renderings are incomplete. All elements including streetscape brick pavers, and bus shelters should be shown in accordance with the CDP.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

32. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 2 indicates 26 feet to 34'-10" for Lawton Street setbacks with reference to page 50 for measurements. It appears from page 50 the setbacks are measured at 2nd story height rather than at grade. Measured at grade, the proposed setback width varies from 14' (minimum required from property line) to approximately 18' from property line, and 24 feet to 30 feet measured from face of curb. Page 2 should reflect these measurements.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

33. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 18, parking plan view should include the pedestrian circulation/crossing shown in illustrations on page 48 to be consistent.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

34. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 49 provides an illustration that speaks to the evolution of the Lawton Street transition design. It would be helpful to the reader if the dotted lines representing the various heights and changes had the heights labeled with dimensions.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

35. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 6 describes the 2<sup>nd</sup> story courtyard along East Broad Street as public open space that will have public programming and direct pedestrian connection on East Broad Street. Will there be specific hours of public access or will it be open to public at all times? Please describe the extent which this space will be public in future submissions.

Response: The spaces available for public use will all have specific hours when they are open to the public. That position is consistent with all public parks and buildings owned and operated by the City. The VCs include specific hours of operation as well as other operational details for the spaces.

36. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 16, for Lawton Street elevation, provide heights for the proposed step downs in addition to the elevation marks currently shown.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

37. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 15 and page 16, what is the building material for the horizontal band that appears on each level? What about the exterior material for Creative Cauldron space? Label all materials.

Response: All materials are now labeled.



38. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 16 is missing the project material summary.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

39. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 18 – 22, label levels by floor and not just by elevation levels as shown.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

40. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 25, update Lawton Street setback to 14 feet provided.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

41. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Doors are shown on page 38 and page 39 for Juliette balconies. Voluntary Concession 15.i states no balconies will be provided facing Lawton Street and 107 Lawton Street, but they are shown on the architectural elevations. Is the intention to provide balconies but make them inaccessible? If this is the case, clarify both in the VCs and the architectural elevations.

Response: The VCs include clarifying language regarding the inaccessible balconies on Lawton Street.

42. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Page 52, View A of the conceptual pocket park shows walls with thickness around the transformer locations as enclosure. This does not appear anywhere in the floor plans or the conceptual development plan. Please clarify the type of screening proposed and include in plans if it has wall thickness. Also provide information as to the level of noise emitted from these transformers in future submissions.

Response: The final screening material has not been finalized. However, a commitment is included in the VCs regarding screening of all transformers.

43. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: The Building Official should be consulted earlier in the process for a determination on building modification for the proposed openings along northern edge because denial may significantly impact the project design.

Response: The Applicant has met with the Building Official regarding all necessary code modifications.

44. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Planting strip along the north elevation on the city's parking lot in illustrations provided on page 48 is not consistent with the Conceptual Development Plan. Update the illustration to reflect the CDP.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

45. Rezoning & Special Exception Review Book/Architectural Plans: Provide details regarding public access and hours for the proposed pocket park.

Response: Consistent with the plaza, the pocket park will have hours of operation consistent with other public spaces in the City. Additional details on the exact operations of the pocket park will be provided at site plan.

46. Shared Parking Analysis: There are a number of inconsistencies in GFA numbers between the study and the plans. Please reconcile. See additional comments in Enclosure 2.

Response: The overall GFA and GFA for specific uses has changed based upon requests from the City regarding the desire for additional office and the elimination of 3-bedroom units. The Applicant believes the parking provided on the site is adequate for the uses being proposed, including the changes in GFA made in response to City comments.

47. Voluntary Concessions: Additional comments and changes should be anticipated as draft VC's undergo review and updates.

Response: Acknowledged.

### **Design and Architecture**

48. **Material:** The existing 2-story commercial development on East Broad Street across from the subject site has brick in a lighter color tone. Consider providing a lighter mixture of materials while using the darker brick as framing elements for certain areas of the elevation, banding and accent features.

Response: See updated architecture.

49. Provide a material sample board. It is hard to read the proposed color scheme and textures for the various materials along the building elevations since they seem to appear different across all the rendered and un-rendered illustrations.

Response: Final material manufacturers and colors will be determined at site plan, at which time the Applicant will provide a material sample board.

50. **Stair Tower:** It appears the fiber cement panels are also proposed for the stair towers seen in perspectives and elevations. Some design thought should be given to the treatment of these towers, particularly at the top, since they do have a strong visual presence given their height over the rest of the buildings.

Response: See updated architecture.

51. **Creative Cauldron Theater Box:** Some thought should be given to designing this box exterior to reflect visually the artistic use of the space. Different materials, signage or color schemes should be explored.

Response: See updated architecture.

52. **Park Place (north) Elevation:** The City Design Guidelines call for “attractive façade treatments on any elevation that is visible from streets or from any primary elevations of adjoining developments and avoiding the use of unadorned blank walls.” The north elevation for the residential building still needs improvement since it still appears to lack a sense of visual interest and complexity. While some improvements were made like additional fenestrations and architectural details, the lack of adequate modulations has the overall composition still assuming a solid wall appearance. Consider providing design elements that adds visual interest to break from a monotonous appearance of the façade. Articulations, modulations and other architectural expressions that provide greater reliefs should be explored. Additional windows and openings are shown on the north elevation. In future submissions, the material selection and composition should focus on greater use of high quality architectural materials like masonry/brick.

Response: See updated architecture and detailed response above.

53. **Massing, Design and Architecture** - The proposed breaks in the massing in the form of 2<sup>nd</sup> story courtyards; the proposed step backs along Lawton Street; and increased setbacks from the northeastern property line and Lawton Street help to provide reliefs in the perceived massing of the building. Furthermore, in order to address height compatibility concerns along northeastern property, one of the 2nd story courtyards was shifted north to provide a break and additional height reductions along the northeastern elevation. The Lawton Street massing has significantly improved as a result.

Response: Acknowledged.

54. **East Broad Elevation:** The proposed breaks and modulations along this elevation provide visual reliefs along the façade. Continue to develop architectural details and articulations along the elevation to avoid monolithic and flat wall planes as the project design evolves.

Response: See updated architecture.

## **Environment**

55. At the October 16 walking tour with the City Council, staff heard comments from the residents with a strong desire to preserve the existing trees along East Broad Street. Work with the City Arborist to explore ways in which these trees can be saved to the extent possible. See Enclosure 4 for details and additional comments.

Response: The trees along E. Broad Street cannot be saved as part of this project because of the scope of work along that frontage.

#### **Applications, Justifications, Statements, Fiscal Impact Data & Architectural Plans**

56. Special exceptions criteria references and justifications will need to be revised and resubmitted as the draft VC's undergo review and updates.

Response: Acknowledged.

57. Fiscal Impact Model Input Data: Provide percent and number of ADUs offered.

Response: Included.

58. Statement of Justification: Justification states the use of a specialty grocer for comprehensive plan compliance statements – what qualifies as a specialty grocer and what if that is not obtained?

Response: We envision the specialty grocer with a user similar to the Local Market or the Italian Store. The VCs contain additional details on pursuit of the specialty grocer and contingencies if the specialty grocer is not obtained.

#### **Comprehensive Plan**

59. The requested Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map change is from "Business" and "Transitional" to "Mixed-Use." The justification provided by the Applicant for the proposed Broad and Washington mixed-use project is based on general goals and strategies identified for the Downtown/City Center Opportunity area. The site is identified for potential redevelopment in the Comprehensive Plan (Comp. Plan Figure 4-12) and the proposed project would provide a mixed-use development with a significant increase in net commercial square footage at the intersection of the two major commercial corridors in the City (Ch. 4, Goal 3). The project would also result in the consolidation of parcels to be developed with a multi-story building and structured parking (Ch. 4, Goals 10, 12, 14). Future revisions and submission should continue to focus on the following goals and strategies as the project moves forward:

- *Chapter 4, Goal 1, Strategy B: Encourage redevelopment that enhances the City's character, while providing economic stability and environmental quality.*
- *Chapter 5, Goal 2, Strategy G: Continue to work with applicants during the development review process to minimize impervious surface areas and to mitigate the effects of runoff from impervious areas post-construction.*
- *Chapter 5, Goal 4, Strategy E: Increase vegetative cover and tree canopy on rooftops and in parking areas to provide shade and reduce impervious surfaces.*

- *Chapter 4, Goal 3, Strategies A & B: Encourage efficient land utilization adjacent to...major thoroughfares...with development that is compatible with the residential nature of the City. Encourage mixed-use development to move persons closer to business and shopping areas.*
- *Chapter 4, Goal 9, Strategy C: Create the greatest level of net new, sustainable commercial space and commercial revenue as possible in the City.*
- *Chapter 4, Goal 8, Strategy A: Create well-designed transitions between residential and commercial districts, and require appropriate buffering between commercial and residential areas to protect neighborhoods from the negative impacts of noise, traffic, light, odors, and visual incompatibility.*

Response: The Comprehensive Plan Statement of Justification includes a detailed explanation of the project's compliance with the Comprehensive Plan recommendation for the property.

#### **Downtown Small Area Plan**

60. The Downtown Falls Church Small Area Plan includes the project site in the Core Entertainment Area (CEA), which is a focused area of dense retail businesses with supporting residential and hotel space. Some residential use is acceptable in the CEA in the form of loft apartments above retail establishments.

The Mobility chapter of the Downtown Small Area Plan also talks about pedestrian improvements throughout the area, including crosswalks, light timing, and curb extensions where applicable. A concept plan with recommended improvements suggests crosswalks on all four legs of the East Broad and North Washington intersection. Consider including 16- foot brick crosswalks for all four legs of the intersection in future submissions. City Design Guidelines

Response: The various Statements of Justification for the project include a detailed explanation of the projects compliance with the Downtown Small Area Plan recommendations.

61. The following elements contained in the City's Design Guidelines should continue to be evaluated and incorporated into the project:
- *Chapter V, A, 1. Massing and Building Footprint – use techniques to reduce perceived mass of large buildings; 9. Strive for designs and materials that reflect the architectural traditions of the region;*
  - *Chapter V, A - Connectivity between Sites and Parking – provide clear pedestrian paths and crossings from parking spaces to main building entrances and street; Provide continuous pedestrian routes where feasible;*
  - *Chapter V, B – Connectivity between sites – make access obstacle-free and consistent between private sites; provide easy-to-use internal circulation not only for vehicles but also for pedestrians and bicyclists between all buildings and spaces within a site; add*

*separate pedestrian pathways within larger parking lots and provide crosswalks at vehicular lanes within a site;*

- *Chapter VI, E, 5. – Facade Organization – provide attractive façade treatments on any elevation that is visible from streets or from any primary elevation of adjoining developments and avoid use of unadorned blank wall.*
- *Guidelines for Commercial and Office Buildings – stepped back heights and varied wall surfaces, avoid monolithic expanse of roof;*
- *Use materials, texture and color changes to help reduce mass and provide visual interest;*
- *Masonry is the most appropriate material for commercial buildings.*

Response: The various Statements of Justification for the project include a detailed explanation of the projects compliance with the City's Design Guidelines.

### **Transportation Planning**

62. See memorandum, dated November 1, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 1).

Response: Acknowledged.

63. Street Furniture Standards The proposed street furniture should be updated to match the City's standards. The materials have been updated since the previous submission. (Sheet C9.0)

- a. The details for the bus shelters should be added.
- b. The bench detail should clarify that either 4 foot or 6 foot benches can be used to adjust to spacing needs.

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

64. Crosswalks Spacing The block length from N Washington Street to Lawton Street is approximately 650 feet. The block length along North Washington Street from Broad Street to Park Avenue is approximately 440 feet. The City's streetscape standards call for crosswalks every 250 feet. (Sheet C4.0)

- a. A location for a midblock crossing has been identified and a refuge island is shown – no change requested.
- b. A marked crosswalk is included crossing Lawton Street – no change requested.
- c. Additionally, a marked crosswalk should be added at the intersection with Lawton Street crossing Broad Street, again with a refuge island – change requested.
- d. Another crosswalk should be provided along North Washington Street should be provided – change requested.

Response: Based upon further analysis by the Applicant and negative feedback from Boards and Commissions, the Applicant has removed the previously shown mid-block crosswalk. We believe there are significant safety concerns with mid-block crosswalks

adjacent to our project. Additionally, based on our review, we do not believe a mid-block crosswalk at the requested locations meets VDOT's standards. For those reasons, we have not included any mid-block crossings in our project.

65. Streetscape Maintenance The voluntary concessions include a provision for development of a streetscape maintenance agreement to be approved during site plan. Responsibility for street trees and street lights should be reviewed with Public Works. (Voluntary Concession 4.iii)

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

66. Broad Street & Washington Street Intersection This project will have a dramatic impact on the look and design of the intersection of Broad Street & North Washington Street. Bringing the entire intersection into compliance with the City's streetscape standards should be explored, including brick paver crosswalks on all legs and decorative mast arms. Update curb geometry should also be considered with tighter curb radii to shorten pedestrian crossing distances.

Response: New brick crosswalks are proposed for all four legs of the Broad Street and Washington Street intersection. We have not made further changes to the intersection because there is no final design showing what future condition is proposed. Additionally, in our experience, performing the work requested can result in very significant additional costs that are not quantifiable until the final work is proposed.

67. Lawton Curb Extension A curb extension should be constructed for the northeast corner of the intersection. This could be incorporated into a neighborhood gateway feature. (Sheet C4.0)

Response: Based upon negative feedback from the Lawton Street neighbors the curb extension and gateway feature are not included in this submission.

68. Garage ADA Access The current ADA access plan assumes ADA access from the garage to North Washington Street will occur via East Broad Street. This should be evaluated for distance. (C4.0)

Response: Acknowledged.

69. Crosswalk Width and Alignment According to guidance from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), crosswalks should be at least as wide as the connecting sidewalks and aligned with the pedestrian pathways. In the case of the Broad Street & Washington Street intersection, this will mean widening the crosswalks and better aligning them with the pedestrian clear space.

Response: See updated CDP.

70. Pocket Park Sidewalk Width The proposed pocket park connecting Lawton Street and the municipal parking lot is a positive enhancement. This could be similar in feel to the Crescent Building on nearby North Westmorland Street in Arlington County. For functionality, the width of the walkway in the park should be increased. A minimum of 5 feet is needed to allow two people to walk wide by side. A width of 6 feet will be more comfortable for people walking in opposite directions.

Response: The final design of the park has not be finalized and the Applicant will evaluate wider sidewalks during that final design phase.

71. Bicycle Parking Tabulation The City's zoning ordinance requires short term and long term, secure bicycle parking. The voluntary concessions reference bicycle parking, but not the amount required. The parking tabulation should be updated to include bicycle parking tabulations. (Sheet C2.0, Voluntary Concession 18)

Response: Acknowledged and changed.

72. Secure Bike Parking Access The residential secure bike parking area is located on a lower level of the garage. A note should be added to the plan sheet making it clear that people can put their bikes in the elevators to access the parking. (Sheet C11.0)

Response: Acknowledged.

73. Bike Share Operating Support The City is actively working to expand bike-share in the City. As part of reducing demand for automobile parking, the project should commit to annual operating support for a bike-share station for the life of the project. (Voluntary Concession #18)

Response: The Applicant agrees with the concept of encouraging bike use and bike-share in the City. As part of the project, significant bike facilities are provided for residents and employees. Additionally, potential bike share locations are shown on the plans and the VCs include a commitment to provide the necessary permissions for future placement of a bike share station. However, the Applicant is not able to commit to an open ended operating cost for a future station.

74. Bike Share Station Location A bike-share location is identified adjacent to the East Broad Street garage entrance. The proposed location should be discussed with the Department of Public Works for accessibility and serviceability. A location closer to Washington Street or Lawton Street may be more suitable. (sheet C7.0)

Response: Acknowledged.

75. TDM Goals The Voluntary Concessions should include specific goals for the TDM and PMP plans. The Voluntary Concessions list trip reduction goals from ITE standards. The Voluntary Concessions should also specify the following: (1) Target transportation mode



share and (2) Target automobile parking reduction from City standards. (Voluntary Concession #9).

Response: See updated VCs and TDM plan.

76. TDM Template City staff has developed a standard TDM template for organizing TDM packages. The proposed TDM should be broken into the following four categories (1) site design, infrastructure, and options, (2) promotion, education, and incentives, (3) monitoring and enforcement, (4) adaptive management. A conceptual TDM should be provided during Special Exception and be finalized as part of Site Plan approval. (No TDM Provided Voluntary Concession #9)

Response: Acknowledged. See enclosed TDM plan.

77. Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) The following should be updated in the TIA:
- LOS A callout box should be included in the executive summary describing automobile Level of Service (LOS), what LOS is typical in this kind of environment, and how automobile LOS is related to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access (Page 4)
  - Planned Transit The list of planned transportation improvements should be updated to note that the City's Comprehensive Plan calls for increasing transit frequency on both Broad Street and Washington Street to provide 15-minute all day service. (Page 5)
  - Bicycle Master Plan The reference to the City's Bicycle Master Plan should be updated to reflect that the plan has been adopted. (Page 9)
  - Transit Service The table of bus information should be expanded to include a column for off-peak service frequency and all service frequencies should be updated to reflect recent service changes. (Pages 11-12)

Response: The Applicant is open to updating the TIA, however, the requested changes do not impact the substantive analysis and recommendations included.

78. Paid Parking The previous comment response referenced a paid parking plan. Paid parking can be an effective way of providing public parking. More detail should be provided. This should be considered in combination with the TDM and Parking Management Plans.

Response: See above responses.

79. Access to City Parking Lot Once constructed, access to the municipal parking lot on Park Place will only be accessible to/from northbound traffic on North Washington Street. A median break on North Washington Street should be explored to allow traffic to/from southbound traffic on North Washington Street.

Response: See above responses.

### **Shared Parking Study**

80. See memorandum, dated November 6, 2017 for comments (Enclosure 2)

Response: Acknowledged.

81. Parking analysis is based on the October 2017 Rezoning & Special Exception Review document. Figures for parking are taken from Appendix 6 and 7 (Page 24), the Gorove/Slade TIA and the Walker Parking Study.

Response: Acknowledged.

82. Traffic counts used for the TIA were taken in 2015 and are nearly three years old at this point. The 301 West Broad project was considered in background for the TIA report, although those counts were estimated since the project was not completed at the time of the counts.

Response: Acknowledged.

83. Parking Overview: The developer is proposing a structured parking garage that is mostly underground or screened from view of adjacent streets by retail or landscaping. Shared parking is proposed as a means of reducing the overall number of spaces; bike parking also is provided.

Response: Acknowledged.

84. 600 parking spaces are proposed for the mixed-use development which is slightly under Walker's recommendation. The zoning ordinance requires 730 spaces using for the office, retail and residential units; the proposed theater is treated as retail for the purposes of the submission although the zoning ordinance has a specific ratio for theater use (1/4 seats for fixed seating and 1/60 square feet for theaters without fixed seating).

Response: Acknowledged.

85. Although two bus shelters are proposed for the project (and there are existing stops in similar locations), Walker's analysis did not take into account in terms of parking demand the availability of transit less than a mile away or the spaces at the Kaiser garage. The developer could also seek a parking reduction from the Planning Commission.

Response: Acknowledged.

86. Residential parking: The proposed parking for the residential units is based on the zoning ordinance requirement which uses the number of bedrooms as the basis for the specific parking ratio. No reduction is provided or proposed by bedroom count or for the ADUs, although Walker distinguishes these, nor is a reduction proposed based on proximity to transit. Parking for residents and their guests will be provided on the two lower levels of the garage. This parking will be access controlled only on the lowest level of the garage, which at 246 spaces, results in a blended ratio of 0.8 spaces reserved per dwelling unit. Parking will be shared with the office on the second level.

Response: Acknowledged.

87. Retail parking: The retail GFA numbers differ between the Walker analysis and the SE submission. Using the SE submission, the parking calculation treats all of the GFA as if it was genuine retail and parks it at this ratio. However, the proposal includes 5,000 square feet of space designated as retail or a black box theater, and 21,300 square feet of space shown as retail but described as restaurant use (one family, one fine/casual, one fast casual) in three restaurants. The 105 spaces proposed exceeds the parking requirements when calculated as retail, but theater and restaurant use have specific ratios that change the requirement:
- Theater, fixed seating –  $\frac{1}{4}$  seats or 25 spaces
  - Theater, without fixed seating - 1/60 sq. ft. or 84 spaces
  - Restaurant – 1/100 sq. ft. of space used by customers. If it is assumed that 25% of the space is NOT used for customers, the requirement would be 123 spaces Based on these ratios, and not taking into account captive users, transit access or shared use of spaces, it's not possible to conclude if the retail spaces are adequate or not for these uses.

Response: Acknowledged.

88. Walker uses 2010 Census data for auto ownership in developing their numbers. Since the 2010 Census won't have data on relatively new multi-family housing in the City, it would be useful to consider actual auto ownership data by unit type and compare to their model using data based on vehicle registrations or decals from the Commissioner of the Revenue. (The 2013 FourSquare TDM Study found that five percent of households in the City have no car and 28 percent have one car. These numbers are lower than the US as a whole though similar to the Washington Metropolitan Area.)

Response: Acknowledged.

89. Bike Parking: The proposal appears to equate loops and spaces; the City requirements anticipate two bikes (two spaces) per loop. The proposal shows approximately 13 bike parking spaces on the retail level which is a reduction from 21 bike parking spaces on this street (retail) level and 125 spaces on the P2 level. The notes indicate that they used the City of Alexandria Bicycle Parking Guide as the source for the requirements rather than the City's zoning ordinance and this should be changed to reflect current requirements. Final locations should be evaluated at the time of site plan review.

Response: Acknowledged.

90. The Plan targets most strategies to residents and not much to office workers and retail tenants and their customers. More thought should be given to reducing SOV trips for office workers. There are no mode share goals, for example.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

91. The shuttle idea is a good one, but the only commitment is to explore it with other buildings and there is no discussion of what the developer is prepared to do beyond discussion.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

92. There is no comparison of the parking proposed to the shared parking table in the ordinance.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

93. Bicycle parking is described but there is no table to see how it relates to use, short vs. long term, location, etc.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

94. A potential Bikeshare station is noted on Broad Street but not discussed in the TDM or whether the developer would fund it or simply provide the space.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

95. The potential bus stops on Broad Street and Washington Street are actually existing bus stops which probably should be required to be replaced.

Response: See VCs.

96. The one-time SmartTrip cards probably will only cover a portion of a month for a resident and are not likely to change driving behavior. The applicant could consider membership in a car sharing service and Capital Bikeshare in addition to the SmartTrip Card.

Response: Seen enclosed TDM Plan

97. Removal of the 13 on-street spaces on Broad Street is an improvement.

Response: Acknowledged.

98. Other comments: With the building virtually on the property line, the impact on the City parking lot during construction, and the possible need for construction easements should be considered.

Response: Acknowledged.

## **Zoning**

99. See memorandum, dated July 6, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 3).

Response: Acknowledged.

100. The proposed variance for parking listed on sheet C2.0 is not necessary unless the Planning Commission refuses to exercise its authority to modify the requirements for parking and/or the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan is found to not justify the reduction. See Sec. 48-970 Reduction in Parking and Subdivision III Administrative Regulations immediately preceding 48-970. Applicant is advised to seek a modification as part of the Planning Commission review of the site plan, based on the TDM. If a variance for provided parking is preferred to the waiver process, contact the zoning office for application to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Response: See above responses.

101. Staff agrees that the front setback for the proposed B zoning is 14 feet from Lawton and 20' from E Broad, measured from the face of curb.

Response: Acknowledged.

102. Properties that are separated from each other by an intervening city street / right of way are not considered to be abutting or adjacent to each other. A city street is city property, and separates such parcels as if the street itself was a parcel.

Response: Acknowledged.

103. Zoning districts that are separated from each other by an intervening city street / right of way are not considered to be abutting or adjacent to each other. As of the current zoning map, city streets are not zoned, and zoning districts end at the right of way.

Response: Acknowledged.

## **Department of Public Works**

104. See memorandum, dated June 27, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 4).

Response: Acknowledged.

105. We recommend investigating the possibility of removing the median on N. Washington St. to the extent that southbound traffic would be able to turn left into Park Pl. We will discuss the merits of this with the applicant's transportation engineer along with the other assumptions in the TIA.

Response: See above responses.

106. Please provide existing and proposed sanitary sewer flows for the development site. Show all assumptions used to develop the flows.

Response: See VCs for additional information on sewer capacity.

107. The Washington and Broad area is a major contributor to a flooding issue on Douglass Ave. due to the almost complete impervious nature of the area. The developer's VC 10.iv. "Storm Drainage and Runoff" is not a VC; it's an acknowledgement that the proposed development will follow City Code Chapter 35, which for quantity concerns will only keep the site from exacerbating downstream issues. Unfortunately, the flooding problem on Douglass Ave. has no viable solution on its own due to space limitations so the City needs redevelopment in this particular sub-watershed to reduce stormwater runoff. It is for this reason City staff strongly urges the development to retain the first inch onsite as the previous submittal's comments noted. We also strongly urge the Planning Commission and City Council to consider this request when evaluating the proposed development.

Response: See above responses.

108. The applicant will be expected to pave one travel lane immediately adjacent to the site frontage along N. Washington St. E. Broad St., and along Lawton St. We request additionally paving the all westbound lanes and the turn lane (approximately 35' from the face of curb) along E Broad St. and then reconfigure the turn lanes to provide access to the driveways along the 100 block of E Broad, including the site's proposed entrance.
- 111.

Response:

109. As part of streetscape improvements, we request moving the existing curbs facing N Washington Blvd. and E. Broad St. be relocated toward the centerline in order to create lane widths of 11' for northbound and eastbound traffic, respectively.

Response: The Applicant explored this option and believes the existing lane widths on E. Broad Street are 11'. Additionally, moving the existing curb line is prohibitively expensive because of existing utilities in the roadway.

110. We request consideration for improvements to the entire intersection of Broad St. and Washington Blvd.; including updates to brick sidewalks, ADA ramps, striping, and signal poles and mast arms.

Response: See above responses.

111. The intersection of E. Broad St. and Lawton St. currently holds water for 2-3 days after rain events. Adjustments to the curb on E. Broad St. must account for this and be

designed to eliminate the ponding at this intersection. Please show the limits of the streetscape improvements to extend past the end of the radius of the east side of Lawton St. Add a note to the V.C. to include addressing the ponding water as part of item 5.i.

Response: The project is designed to address this existing condition.

112. See attached email and Tree Commission comments for further details (Enclosure 5).

Response: Acknowledged.

113. VCs – Include a payment of \$20,000 to the City for planting projects to offset the permanent loss of greenspace on the site, as requested by the Tree Commission. City Code requires by-right mixed use projects to have 15% of the site area in landscaped open ground. Translated into canopy cover, 15% of the Insight site could be covered by 141 average-sized trees within ten years of planting. At the City's standard landscaping bond value of \$750 per tree, that 15% site cover would be worth over \$105,000.

Response: VCs include this contribution.

114. VCs 5i (iii) Streetscape – Insight offers to maintain the streetscape except for the trees. If the project will maintain the streetscape planters and irrigation, it must also maintain the trees. This latter system was included in the Kensington's VCs.

Response: See updated VCs.

115. VCs 5i (iii) Streetscape – If a shrub bed across Lawton Street (sheet C6.0) is to be installed by this project, then the maintenance of that planting must be specifically included in the VCs.

Response: This option has been removed.

116. Planting Detail (sheet C7.0) – The open soil of streetscape beds needs to measure at least 5 feet across, as shown. However, the underground portion of the planter bed needs to be at least 6 feet wide. A standard irrigation system (not drip) is also required.

Response: Acknowledged.

117. The plan note (sheet C7.0) calling for connected planters underground where utilities allow is appreciated.

Response: Acknowledged.

118. The existing street trees along Lawton Street do not need the sidewalk straightened as proposed. Although straightening as proposed would result in more unpaved rooting space, any disruption within the root zone carries risk of damage.

Response: Acknowledged.

119. Planting the space above the garage behind the building (sheet C6.0) is noted and appreciated.

Response: Acknowledged.

120. The garage wall facing Lawton Street needs to have an evergreen screen planting that functions like the one existing there now. The conceptual landscape plan (sheet C6.0) shows small groupings of shrubs, with most of the wall left exposed to view.

Response: Additional evergreens are proposed along the garage wall.

121. The planting bed between the Lawton Street sidewalk and the Creative Cauldron part of the new building should be raised by at least a couple of inches to protect it from foot traffic.

Response: Acknowledged.

122. The sidewalk squiggle at the corner of Lawton makes no sense. People will walk in a straight line from the brick sidewalk to the concrete one; very few people ever walk in a convoluted line unless there is a wall to prevent normal forward movement. The landscape bed within this squiggle will be trampled and erode.

Response: The sidewalk configuration is needed to ADA requirements.

123. The sidewalk stub at the north end of the Lawton Street side should be placed toward the property line, rather than centered on the ROW, so the future sidewalk will allow a planting strip large enough for trees.

Response: Acknowledged.

124. I support the concept of planting between the building's back wall and the city-owned parking lot (sheet C6.0). Due to the small space available, the project will need to include small-stature trees with narrow crowns.

Response: Acknowledged.

### **Housing and Human Services**

125. See memorandum, dated November 2, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 6).

Response: Acknowledged.

126. In line with the City of Falls Church Affordable Housing Policy, a minimum of 6% of units should be proffered as Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs). The Policy recommends that the ADUs be the same mix as the entire project, however Housing and Human



Services requests that all of the ADUs be studios that can be offered at a lower rent and/or larger units with den or two or more bedrooms. The supply of one bedroom ADUs in the City is currently sufficient to meet the need. All units should be affordable to households with incomes at 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI). No amenities fees shall be charged to ADU residents.

Response: The VCs include an option at the City's request to provide all efficiency and two-bedroom units. The VCs provide that no amenities fees will be charged to ADU residents.

127. The Department of Housing and Human Services recognizes that the ADU policy is silent regarding the (control period) term and requests the control period run through the life of the property.

Response: The control period term has been removed so that the ADUs are provided through the life of the project.

### **Economic Development**

128. See Fiscal Impact Analysis, dated November 3, 2017 (Enclosure 7).

Response: Acknowledged.

### **Building Safety**

129. See memorandum, dated October 18, 2017 (Enclosure 8).

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

130. Please submit a description of the structure.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

131. Please submit a code analysis and life safety plan.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

132. Please submit a LEED check list.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

133. Please submit a fire flow calculation.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

134. Please note that openings in walls in close proximity to the property line must comply with Table 602 and Section 705.8.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

135. Please verify that there will be an accessible route from accessible retail parking spaces to each of the retail tenant spaces.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

136. For community resilience and safety during extended power outages we recommend a “Building Generator” voluntary concession to power the following:

- a. Fire alarm,
- b. Exit lights,
- c. Emergency lighting,
- d. Night lighting,
- e. Domestic water pumps,
- f. At least one elevator in each building,
- g. Fire pump, if required.

Response: Included in the VCs.

137. Please consider providing a Fire Control Room for the residential building with direct access from the outside.

Response: The Applicant met with the Building Official to address these concerns and has incorporated responses into the CDP and VCs.

**Fire Official**

138. See memorandum, dated October 25, 2017 for comments and further details (Enclosure 9).

Response: Acknowledged.

139. Identify high-rise fire protection package: The building footprint with parking will impose a challenge for fire/rescue units due to the limited accessibility for the Fire Department. A clear definition of the intent of providing a high-rise fire protection package shall be clearly stated. This shall include all typical components including, but not limited to, generator, pressurized stairwells, fire pump, monitored alarm system and fire command center. Will this mixed use project have one fire command center? Will systems be inter-connected?

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

140. Show location of Fire System components and rooms: fire control room, fire pump room, electrical rooms, generator location, and chemical room (if equipped with a swimming pool), fire hydrant locations, fire enunciator panel, main fire control panel, FDC location and fire pump test intake location.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

141. Location of Fire Department Connection (FDC): Shall be within 75 feet of the fire hydrant. Design planning shall accommodate that fire hose, when connected between the hydrant location and the FDC, remains unobstructed. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks or outdoor café shall obstruct this area. Fire hose when deployed from the FDC to the hydrant location shall not cross roadways, driveways to/from a parking garage, or egress/access points into or away from the structure.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

142. Building Egress and Access Points: Design planning shall provide that ALL egress and access points provide egress away from the building without obstructions. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks shall obstruct the means of egress away from the building.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

143. Streetscape: The Fire Official shall review and approve all streetscape to assure interoperability for the building egress, emergency responder operations and unhampered access to building systems.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

144. Radio Coverage Compliance: Public Safety Radio Coverage Compliance, this requirement is not only for the underground parking garage but includes coverage requirements inside and aboveground in the building to include stairwells. *The space and amplification equipment shall be provided and maintained by the building owner.* Certification by a Professional Engineer shall be provided showing the testing of signal strength and coverage has been met along with testing by the Falls Church Police Department and the Arlington County Fire Department prior to the final C.O. being issued. The City Fire Official is the point of coordination for all city emergency services for approval of radio compliance.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

145. Emergency Generators: Shall have a generator sized accordingly to supply and sustain fire protection systems, emergency lighting and ventilation, Public Safety Radio systems, elevator service, sump pumps as well as domestic water in order to sustain sanitary systems and other critical functions that are to remain viable during extended outages. Generators are preferred to be natural gas supplied (diesel generators are limited by fuel supply and will also require annual permits).

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

146. Designated Fire Lanes: Fire Lanes for emergency response shall be designated and approved by the Fire Official and shall be marked according to code.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

147. Signage: Signage will be required throughout the building in accordance with requirements set by the Fire Official. This shall include identification of all exterior doors on ground level, stair and floor level landings inside stairwells, equipment rooms and FDC location. FDC shall be equipped with a "red (non-auditable) strobe light above the FDC that activates during alarm mode.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

148. Garages and Medic Units: If it is anticipated that emergency vehicles will enter into a covered structure (garage), applicant must supply detailed specifications to meet clearance and weight requirements for fire apparatus including medic units. This includes height, width, turning radius and weight support.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

149. Fire Dept Knox Box(s): Shall be installed where designated by the Fire Official.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

150. Parking Spaces: The project shall have a least two designated parking spaces for POLICE - FIRE MARSHAL needs (including signage).

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

151. Pre-Construction Meeting: A Pre-Construction meeting will be required to review the requirements of chapter 33 of the *Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code*.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

152. Fire Apparatus Access: Accessibility to emergency systems must be clearly defined to include Fire Command Center, FDC and Test Connections. There shall be clear planning for Fire Apparatus/EMS response and parking to access the building while maintaining traffic flow on Broad and Washington Streets. The only accessible parking area is off of Park Place. Applicant should demonstrate the effectiveness of accomplishing this task during PEAK USE TIMES of the neighboring commercial businesses that utilize Park Place including the State Theatre to determine if this can be accomplished. NOTE: Fire Department Access roads are required to be 20 feet in width.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

153. Applicant shall follow all codes and apply for permits for approval by the Fire Official under the *Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code* including but not limited to demolition and construction (chapter 33), blasting (chapter 56), hot work (chapter 35), removal of underground storage tanks, hazardous material mitigation, locations of fire department connections, fire command centers, Knox box locations, hydrants locations and fire lanes. Further clarification may be directed to the City Fire Marshal at (703) 248-5058.

Response: The Applicant has reached out to the Fire Official and the Building Official to resolve these issues.

Sincerely,



Scott E. Adams